Automated Decision-Making Systems (ADS) Workgroup Meeting

August 12, 2021

Agenda for August 12, 2021 Meeting

Agenda

2:30	Welcome and administrative updates – Katy Ruckle
2:35	Overview of Procurement in Washington – Elena McGrew, DES
3:05	How Policymakers Should or Shouldn't Use AI to Make Decisions – Ryan Calo, UW Law
3:40	System Ranking Results – Katy
3:45	Answers to Open Tasks – Assigned work group members
4:00	Workgroup questions and discussion – All
4:15	Open Discussion
4:30	Adjourn

Welcome and Administrative Updates

Administrative Updates

- Teams Channel is established for Workgroup members
- We can collaborate on drafts and share resources
- I will send out invites to the channel before our next meeting
- We will see how it works – may need some flexibility since it is a new platform for many people and variety of external partners

- New Co-Chair! Dr. David Luxton from Department of Corrections has agreed to co-chair the ADS workgroup

Automated Decision-making Systems Workgroup

Overview of Procurement in Washington –
Elena McGrew, DES

Presenter – Elena McGrew

- Acting Statewide Enterprise Procurement Manager for Contracts and Procurement Division at DES
- Contracts and Procurement since 2015
- Elena leads team of Procurement Strategists
- Consult on complex state procurements
- Create procurement tools and procedures to improve statewide procurement practices

How Policymakers Should or Shouldn't Use AI to Make Decisions – Ryan Calo, UW Law

Presenter – Ryan Calo

- Professor at UW School of Law
- Founding co-director of the UW Tech Policy Lab and the UW Center for an Informed Public
- Holds adjunct appointments at the UW Information School and the Paul G. Allen School of Computer Science and Engineering
- Expert in law and technology
- Focus on privacy, artificial intelligence, and robotics

System Selection and Rankings

System Selection

- Thank you for your votes!
- To understand ranking – weighted 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th choices
  - 1st = 4 pts
  - 2nd = 3 pts
  - 3rd = 2 pts
  - 4th – 1 pt
- Rankings:
  - DOC = 1st place with 64 Points
  - DCYF SDMRA and DCYF SA = Tie for 2nd and 3rd place with 56 points each
  - DSHS = 4th place with 33 points

Results/Raw Data

	Voter	1st choice	2nd choice	3rd choice	4th choice
1	WM001	DOC	DSHS	DCYF SDMRA	DCYF SA
2	WM002	DOC	DCYF SDMRA	DCYF SA	DSHS
3	WM003	DOC	DCYF SA	DSHS	DCYF SDMRA
4	WM004	DCYF SDMRA	DCYF SA	DOC	DSHS
5	WM005	DCYF SDMRA	DCYF SA	DOC	DSHS
6	WM006	DOC	DCYF SDMRA	DCYF SA	DSHS
7	WM007	DCYF SA	DOC	DSHS	DCYF SDMRA
8	WM008	DCYF SA	DCYF SDMRA	DSHS	DOC
9	WM 009	DOC	DCYF SA	DCYF SDMRA	DSHS
10	WM010	DCYF SDMRA	DOC	DSHS	DCYF SA
11	WM011	DCYF SDMRA	DCYF SA	DOC	DSHS
12	WM012	DOC	DSHS	DCYF SDMRA	DCYF SA
13	WM013	DCYF SA	DOC	DSHS	DCYF SDMRA
14	WM014	DCYF SA	DOC	DCYF SDMRA	DSHS
15	WM015	DOC	DCYF SDMRA	DCYF SA	DSHS
16	WM016	DCYF SDMRA	DCYF SA	DOC	DSHS
17	WM017	DCYF SDMRA	DCYF SA	DSHS	DOC
18	WM018	DOC	DCYF SDMRA	DCYF SA	DSHS
19	WM019	DCYF SA	DCYF SDMRA	DOC	DSHS
20	WM020	DOC	DCYF SA	DSHS	DCYF SDMRA
21	WM021	DOC	DSHS	DCYF SDMRA	DCYF SA

OPDP

Tabulated Results

DOC	Pts
10 first place votes x 4 pts=	40
4 second place votes x 3 pts=	12
5 third place votes x 2 pts =	10
2 fourth place vote x 1 pt=	2
21 votes Total =	**64**

DCYF SA	Pts
5 first place votes x 4 pts =	20
8 second place votes x 3 pts =	24
4 third place votes x 2 pts =	8
4 fourth place votes x 1	4
21 votes Total =	**56**

DCYF SDMRA	Pts
6 first place votes x 4 pts =	24
6 second place votes x 3 pts =	18
5 third place votes x 2 pts =	10
4 fourth place votes x 1 pt =	4
21 votes Total =	**56**

DSHS	Pts
0 first place votes x 4 pts =	0
3 second place votes x 3 pts =	9
7 third place votes x 2 pts =	14
11 fourth place votes x 1 pt =	10
21 votes Total =	**33**

Answers to Open Tasks – Assigned work group members

Open Task Resolution

Action Item*	Description	Person Responsible	Resolution
01.01	Provide the Workgroup with a description of how the ADS systems described in the budget proviso were selected.	Katy Ruckle	Contacted others in the state who may have the information and could not learn anymore background on selection process. Also reviewed the SB 5116 hearings but no information was provided in those hearings. My best guess is the agencies and systems were identified because of human services impacts.
01.02	Complete survey ranking presentations	All WG Members	Completed 8-4-21 – 21 workgroup members voted to rank systems for selection. This meets the quorum standard set by the workgroup. A quorum is 16.

Open Task Resolution

Action Item*	Description	Person Responsible	Resolution
01.03	Provide the Workgroup with what information is made available to the public regarding the DSHS hospital admissions system.	Jenise Gogan	There is not more information publicly available regarding the admissions because of the sensitive nature of commitment hearings, but the information is shared with advocates and defense counsel who work on patients' behalf. In addition, the data elements considered were part of the TrueBlood settlement and subsequent legislation. For more information on the TrueBlood settlement please see: https://www.dshs.wa.gov/bha/trueblood-et-al-v-washington-state-dshs

How can someone be referred for services at WSH?

Patients must come to WSH by court order.

Civil Commitment (RCW 71.05) -- After a mental health professional evaluate a person with a mental illness, they have the authority to detain him/her to an evaluation and treatment center for up to 72 hours. If further detainment is needed, they will petition the court. The court will hold a hearing where a decision is made whether or not to admit the person to the state hospital.   Patients do not come to WSH until after receiving a court order for treatment of their mental illness.

Criminal Commitment (RCW 10.77) – When a person has been arrested and suspected of crime, a judge can request a competency evaluation to determine if they are capable of assisting in their own defense. The evaluation can be done either in jail or at WSH. Sometimes a person needs treatment to become competent to stand trial. When this occurs, the person is admitted to WSH for a longer period of time. If they are found to be "non-restorable," their criminal charges can be dropped and they can be civilly committed to the hospital. Other times, people are found not-guilty-by-reason of insanity. These patients can stay at WSH for up to the amount of time of what would have been a maximum sentence for their crime.

With various forms of treatment and medication, all patients at WSH are working towards recovery and eventually reintegrating into a productive life in their home community.

Open Task Resolution

Action Item*	Description	Person Responsible	Resolution
01.04	Research whether disability status was considered in examination of bias in either DCYF system.	Vicki Ybarra	No. DCYF does not have regular access to parental disability status data in a systematic way that would allow for such analysis.
01.05	Identify the POC who can provide additional information about redress associated with WA ONE.	David Luxton	Contacts can be found on the DOC website, located here: https://www.doc.wa.gov/corrections/community/contact.htm#reentry
01.06	Seek clarification on the level of access WSIPP may have to the WA ONE weights and algorithm in their evaluation of bias.	David Luxton	WSIPP presently has the information (including tool design/function parameters) to appropriately evaluate the WA ONE, including for bias, within scope of DoC's contract with them.
01.07	Add future Workgroup agenda item for discussion of methodologies and approaches for evaluating bias. For example, bias as an input, weight, output, or other influence.	Katy Ruckle	To be addressed at future ADS Workgroup meetings.
02.01	Resend link for ranked-choice voting to members who have not yet voted and announce the system selected at the next meeting.	Katy Ruckle	Link resent to workgroup members 7-30-21.

Open Discussion

OPDP

Workgroup questions and discussion – All

OPDP

Thank you!